DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 460 685 JC 020 113

AUTHOR	Bashford, Joanne
TITLE	Report on Users' Satisfaction with Services Provided by Institutional Research. Research Report.
INSTITUTION	Miami-Dade Community Coll., FL. Office of Institutional Research.
REPORT NO	M-DCC-RR-2001-04R
PUB DATE	2001-07-00
NOTE	43p.; Figures for tables provided by Steven Folsom.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Attitudes; Community Colleges; *Information Services; Institutional Research; Program Evaluation; Teacher Attitudes; Two Year Colleges; User Needs (Information); *User Satisfaction (Information); *Users (Information); World Wide Web
IDENTIFIERS	*Miami Dade Community College FL

ABSTRACT

The Office of Institutional Research (IR) at Miami-Dade Community College (M-DCC) (Florida) offers the results of a survey regarding the use of the office's services. Instead of using hard copy format as in the past, the current survey was conducted online. An e-mail message requesting participation was sent to the 3,498 employees with e-mail addresses. The response rate was 9% (332 responses), higher than the rate in any previous user satisfaction survey. In general, 42% of responses were received from staff, 31% from management, and 22% from faculty. Among full-time personnel at M-DCC, faculty comprise 30%, management 17%, and classified staff 53%. Using this as a guide, the survey determined that management personnel were much more likely to have responded to the survey. Results indicated that: (1) respondents were most familiar with IR publications (40% indicated they had received them); (2) 30% of respondents had visited the IR Web site; (3) 27% had requested special information or research from the IR office; (4) management respondents were most likely to have visited the IR Web site (53%), while faculty were least likely (12%); and (5) 96% of respondents who were able to rate the accuracy of the information on the Web site agreed or strongly agreed with its accuracy. (Contains six tables, with the 2000-2001 effectiveness plan and survey instrument appended.) (NB)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 460 685

Report on Users' Satisfaction with Services Provided by Institutional Research

Research Report No. 2001-04R

July 2001

Institutional Research

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

I. Bashford

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

TC020113

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Miami-Dade Community College

REPORT ON USERS' SATISFACTION WITH SERVICES PROVIDED BY INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

Research Report No. 2001-04R

July 2001

Joanne Bashford
Associate Director

Figures for Tables Provided by
Steven Folsom
Staff Associate

Miami-Dade Community College

INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

Cathy Morris
District Director

Table of Contents

Page

Executive Summary and Conclusions 1

Introduction 1

Background 2

Methodology 2

Results 2

Who responded to the survey? 2

Which services are being used and by whom? 3

How did respondents rate Institutional Research publications? 3

How did respondents rate the Institutional Research web site? 3

How did respondents rate the service provided by Institutional Research when requesting special information or research? 4

What did users think Institutional Research does well? 4

In what areas did respondents believe Institutional Research could improve? 5

Final Note 7

Appendix A 12-21

Appendix B 22-24

List of Tables

Page

Table 1 Survey Respondents by Job Role 8

Table 2 Survey Respondents by Area of Responsibility 8

Table 3 Use of Services by Job Role of Survey Respondents 8

Table 4 Institutional Research User Satisfaction Survey Items Related to Publications by Job Role 9

Table 5 Institutional Research User Satisfaction Survey Items Related to Web Site by Job Role 10

Table 6 Institutional Research User Satisfaction Survey Items Related to Requests for Special Information or Research by Job Role 11

Report on Users' Satisfaction with
Services Provided by Institutional Research

Executive Summary and Conclusions:

The Office of Institutional Research strives to provide excellent service to the College community as an information and research resource. As part of an on-going effort to assess the office, this user satisfaction survey was conducted to determine level of satisfaction with services provided and to gather suggestions for improvement. The results were overwhelmingly favorable for all three areas surveyed (reports and publications, web site, and special research requests). All received agreement ratings well above 90% for most dimensions. The results also support the effectiveness of recent strategies to become more responsive to the changing needs of the College and to utilize technology to a greater extent in disseminating information. Some excellent suggestions for improvement were made and will be addressed by Institutional Research.

Conclusion: ***Survey results indicate that Institutional Research is doing a very good job of meeting the information and research needs of the College community. The survey results and suggestions will be used to formulate strategies to improve and modify services to keep up with the changing needs of the College.***

Introduction:

The Office of Institutional Research strives to be a high-quality, service-oriented participant and contributor to Miami-Dade Community College. As part of an on-going effort to assess the effectiveness of the office and services provided, Institutional Research periodically asks its users to provide feedback on the service received. One of the primary purposes of Institutional Research is to serve as an information resource for the College – a purpose for which user feedback is invaluable to ensure that the service provided meets their needs. If Institutional Research is effective in fulfilling this purpose, the following can be expected:

- Users will receive information that is accurate, meets their needs, and supports decision-making.
- Research Reports, Information Capsules, Research Notes, and other publications will address issues that are relevant, timely, and objective.
- The web page will contain information that meets or exceeds the routine data needs of the College.
- Data for special requests will be provided whenever possible, and within a reasonable amount of time.

While the Office of Institutional Research serves numerous other purposes, they are not as amenable to evaluation through College user surveys. Therefore, the current survey evaluation focuses on the information resource purpose and expected results listed above.

An important, but less visible, role that Institutional Research fills is in meeting state and federal reporting requirements through the verification and submission of the Student Database, ensuring the accuracy of State Accountability and Equity Reports, and supplying data for IPEDS, Title III, Title V, College Board and other reports.

In addition, Institutional Research captures data related to placements and outcomes in workforce education programs, such as OCPs, LCPs, and supplemental job placement information. Enrollment projections and monitoring are coordinated through Institutional Research. The administration and coordination of college-wide testing and student feedback programs through the Campus Testing Departments is also the responsibility of Institutional Research. Finally, the Office plays a key role in the

Strategic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness processes at the College. The 2000-2001 Effectiveness Plan for Institutional Research details the many main purposes served by the office, as well as how achievement of expected results will be measured. A copy of the plan is included in Appendix A.

Background

The Office of Institutional Research has conducted user satisfaction surveys previously, most recently in 1994 (R.R. 95-01R) and in 1991 (R.R. 91-14R). Results from these surveys have provided valuable insight into the needs and perceptions of users and have prompted numerous changes. One of the changes was the assignment of an Institutional Research professional to each campus as a research liaison. This was done to increase campus access to services and ensure that issues addressed are relevant at the campus as well as the college level.

While Institutional Research publications generally received high marks for readability in previous surveys, several new formats were adopted. The Research Note format, which is a brief report and receives limited, targeted distribution, is used to report special request information. Executive summaries, which precede reports and capsules to provide a quick overview of results, were added to facilitate access to and use of findings.

In addition to changes made in response to survey results, the nature of the times has dictated a number of other changes. The Office of Institutional Research has become accustomed to responding very quickly to special requests and shifting priorities in keeping with the immediate needs of the College. There has also been considerable movement toward providing information electronically. Abstracts, Information Capsules, and Research Notes are being e-mailed to users in PDF format to facilitate distribution. The Institutional Research web page was created to provide quick, easy, user-friendly access to frequently requested data and information. An electronic factbook was included recently to provide a more complete picture of the College, accessible to anyone through the Internet.

Methodology

The current user survey builds on surveys administered in the past, but incorporates new items to capture input on some of the changes made by Institutional Research. A copy of the instrument is included in Appendix B. A reliability analysis using Cronbach's coefficient alpha was conducted on the Likert scaled items and the instrument was determined to be very reliable ($r = .94$).

Instead of sending the survey in hard copy format to a selected distribution, as in the past, the current survey was conducted on-line using a Front Page form. Responses were saved to a text file, then imported and analyzed using PC-SAS. An e-mail message requesting participation, including a direct link to the survey, was sent to all employees with e-mail addresses at the College through a college-wide distribution list (3,498 addresses).

While the response rate was only about 9%, this method resulted in 332 responses, more than in any previous user satisfaction survey conducted by Institutional Research. Many of the individuals receiving the e-mail message were unfamiliar with Institutional Research services and publications to date. It is hoped that this survey method achieved the goal of gathering feedback from as many users as possible, with the added benefit of increasing the visibility of the office for those who had not used Institutional Research services.

Results

Who responded to the survey?

Table 1 displays the self-reported job role of the survey respondents and Table 2 displays the self-reported areas of responsibility of survey respondents. The highest proportion of survey responses were

received by staff (42%), followed by management (31%) and faculty (22%). Among full-time personnel at M-DCC, faculty comprise 30%, management represent 17%, and classified staff comprise 53%. Using this as a guide, management personnel were much more likely to have responded to the survey, while faculty and staff response rates were somewhat lower than expected.

Student services was selected by twenty-nine percent of the survey respondents as their area of responsibility, and the same percentage indicated that their area was not one of the choices listed for this question. Twenty-two percent selected classroom, 14% selected academic affairs, and 5% selected business/finance as their area of responsibility.

Which services are being used and by whom?

Respondents were most familiar with Institutional Research publications (134 or 40% indicated that they had received them) (Table 3). Thirty percent (101 respondents) indicated that they had visited the Institutional Research web site and 27% (90 respondents) had requested special information or research from the office. Survey respondents who were in management roles were most likely to say they had received Institutional Research publications (74%) and staff were least likely (21%). Survey respondents who were in management roles were also most likely to say they had visited the Institutional Research web site (53%), while faculty were least likely (16%). Finally, survey respondents who were in management roles were most likely to say they had requested special information or research (58%), and staff were least likely (12%).

How did respondents rate Institutional Research publications?

Institutional Research publications were rated very highly by respondents who received them. Table 4 presents agreement ratings for the survey items related to the publications by job role of respondent. Because a number of respondents were unable to rate the publications along some of the dimensions, an agreement rating for respondents who were able to rate the item is included for each.

One hundred percent of the respondents who were able to rate the items agreed or strongly agreed that the publications report on issues and topics relevant to M-DCC, and are well written. The publications received a lower rating for their usefulness in decision-making (89% overall). Faculty indicated that the publications are less useful in decision-making (82% agreement rating) than management or staff respondents (91% and 88% agreement ratings, respectively).

Many of the items in this section appeared on the 1991 and 1994 surveys, but the response scale was different, making direct comparisons problematic. As mentioned previously, Institutional Research varied the format of the publications somewhat since the 1994 survey. It was hoped that these changes would result in publications that are easier to read and understand, more timely, and more useful to decision-makers. It does appear that the reports are more useful in decision-making. Eighty four percent of respondents in the 1994 surveys rated the usefulness of reports in decision-making as good or excellent. In the current survey, 89% of respondents who were able to rate the publications on this dimension agreed or strongly agreed that they were useful in decision-making. Other comparable items related to publications received consistent ratings across the 1994 and 2001 survey administrations.

How did respondents rate the Institutional Research web site?

Table 5 presents agreement ratings for survey items related to the Institutional Research web site. The web site was rated highly by respondents and received the highest rating for accuracy (96% of respondents able to rate this dimension agreed or strongly agreed). The lowest rating was obtained for the item pertaining to information being current (89% agreed or strongly agreed, if able to rate). This rating has prompted Institutional Research to add information to each web page indicating date of last update and anticipating when new data will be available for posting.

The number of respondents who indicated that they had visited the web site, and the ratings received for the site, suggest that this method of sharing routine information is well received by the College.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

How did respondents rate the service provided by Institutional Research when requesting special information or research?

The agreement ratings for items related to special information or research requests are presented in Table 6. In general, users seem to be very satisfied with the service Institutional Research provides in response to their requests. In particular, the service was rated very highly for being understandable (100% of respondents who were able to rate the service agreed or strongly agreed) and timely (99% agreed or strongly agreed). The item receiving the lowest rating was 'suggests alternative if unable to provide needed service' (94% agreed or strongly agreed).

Although many of these items were included in the 1991 and 1994 surveys very few respondents completed these items in the past (32 and 27 responses, respectively). Comparisons with previous surveys are not made for this reason, as one or two dissatisfied respondents can alter the overall ratings noticeably. However, based on the number of respondents in the current survey who indicated that they had requested special information (90 respondents), it is evident that the volume of special requests has increased. Requesting special information has become almost as routine as receiving publications from Institutional Research (134 respondents received publications).

As mentioned previously, Institutional Research has attempted to be more responsive to the immediate needs of the College by being available to fill special requests for information. By placing routine information on the web, staff have more time available for special requests. By having a campus liaison for research, the office has become more visible and accessible to the College community. It appears that these strategies are achieving the results for which they were intended.

What did users think Institutional Research does well?

Users were asked to comment on what Institutional Research does well. Almost a hundred comments were received noting a variety of strengths. Recurring themes were identified in the comments and characterized as "information resource," "reports and publications," "customer service," and "contribution to the College."

The **"information resource"** theme was the most common. It appears that Institutional Research is recognized among its users as an excellent source for information. Respondents frequently cited specific examples of information they needed and obtained quickly for grant applications or reports. Sample comments from this category include:

> "They have a lot of knowledge about everything that relates to the college and the students."
>
> "Statistics used to prepare external funding proposals; demographics describing student populations; assessment of M-DCC's effectiveness in re. CLAST success. . ."
>
> "Provide accurate statistical information about our student population."
>
> "IR provides useful and expert information upon request."
>
> "I believe that IR responds well when requests are made with little notice. The staff are always willing to offer assistance."

"Reports and publications" also received many comments from respondents. Institutional Research was commended for providing a variety of reports, written in such a way as to be understandable by the users. Sample comments from this category include:

> "The reports are timely and informational. They are presented in a format that is easy to understand and use."

"Clear, concise research."

"Most reports are easy to read and informative. Certain 'high priority' reports have been completed in record time."

"The reports are informative and useful in determining issues that need to be addressed at the College."

A strong **"customer service"** orientation by Institutional Research personnel was noted in many of the comments. Sample comments from this category include:

"Dr. Catherine Morris and her staff are very professional, competent and caring."

"You guys are always there when needed."

"...especially the staff that thinks outside the box and comes up with alternative ways to get the info requested...."

The final theme that emerged was **"contribution to the College."** Many comments noted the usefulness of Institutional Research reports and presentations in College planning and decision-making. Sample comments from this category include:

"Provides data useful for the programs to make informed decisions."

"I am very grateful to IR for their instrumental role and support in College-related documentation."

"...assistance in developing Institutional Effectiveness grids/measures for administrative areas."

In what areas did respondents believe Institutional Research could improve?

Respondents were asked to comment on how they believed Institutional Research could improve its services. The comments were reviewed and several themes emerged: "visibility and distribution," "web enhancements," "focus of research and reports," "planning and interaction with College," and "specific research suggestions."

As mentioned previously, this survey was sent to the entire College e-mail distribution rather than to individuals on the report distribution list as in past surveys. Apparently, a number of recipients were unfamiliar with Institutional Research, so it is no surprise that a very common area for improvement would be **"visibility and distribution."** Respondents suggested that Institutional Research find ways to make the College community more aware of the services provided and to distribute reports and capsules to a wider audience. *Institutional Research will consider ways to do this.* Sample comments from this category include:

"More information should be provided to the College Community about IR and its services."

"...getting more information out to the College population about its services and its publications should be a bigger priority. The info is not getting to support staff adequately, for example."

"Design seminars on each campus, including Hialeah Center to inform faculty and staff about services and possible projects."

"...providing research reports to more interested groups of employees such as Academic Advisors and Intervention Specialists....it would be helpful if we were on the direct 'mailing list'."

Many specific suggestions were offered about **"web enhancements."** A number of respondents suggested that the web site should be kept up-to date. Institutional Research strives to keep the

information as up-to-date as possible. Some statistics, particularly state and national comparisons are provided by external agencies and may not be as current as M-DCC statistics generated by Institutional Research. *Institutional Research will provide better notations on web pages indicating date of most recent update, and when new information is anticipated.*

Additional sample comments from the 'web enhancements" category include:

> "I was going to recommend that you put the full reports on the web, but I noticed that is now being done. 1) I think it might be beneficial to have past reports put on there as well. 2) Perhaps you could add a search feature ...." *Institutional Research is currently working on putting full text of past reports on the web.*
>
> "Provide a search engine within the Institutional Research/Testing web page." *Institutional Research looked into search engines and determined that the College web site search engine will serve this purpose. The College search engine links to Institutional Research web pages. Users need to simply type in the key words of interest.*
>
> "The basic data should be annualized if possible even though semester or partial year data may be available." *Institutional Research is in the process of adding term/annual enrollment data by campus/center to the web.*

Several suggestions were made concerning the **"focus of research and reports,"** most requesting additional level of detail as in program, school or department level statistics. Sample comments from this category include:

> "We could use more information on the campus alone concerning such issues as financial aid and students on plus ethnicity." *Institutional Research handles most requests for specific information on an individual basis. Financial aid disbursements are being added to our data files and this information will be added to our web site.*
>
> "When you publish the report for Vocational and Non-credit courses, you should separate these two categories as they are no longer the same department." *Institutional Research will be separating the vocational and various categories of non-credit enrollment in the next annual profile. These areas are already separated on our web site and will be separated in enrollment monitoring beginning Fall 2001.*
>
> "Perhaps not improve as much as have the ability to provide more program specific assistance." *Program specific data have been provided through special information requests. Institutional Research will explore ways to make program managers more aware of this service.*
>
> "More specific info on the Schools would be helpful." *Institutional Research will work with the School Directors to explore ways to provide school level data in the most meaningful format.*

Some of the comments in the **"planning and interaction with the College"** category suggested that Institutional Research work more closely with people at the department, program or campus level to frame research and provide useful information. Other comments pertained to interpreting results of the research. The following comments are examples of this type:

> "Ask Departments what kinds of data questions would allow them to operate more effectively." *Institutional Research will ask the Academic Deans and Discipline Chairs for suggestions on data needs.*
>
> "Help us a bit with the conclusions, or extrapolation, to our population." *Institutional Research will be adding 'conclusions' to reports and capsules whenever appropriate.*

"Be a little more proactive in putting together useful and helpful information on enrollees. CLAST results, etc. Don't wait to be asked." *Institutional Research will explore ways to better anticipate the research needs of the College.*

A number of comments were received offering **"specific research suggestions."** Some of the requests received include the following:

"Staffing issues need to get more focus, as well as the major changes in faculty demographics with the greater and greater emphasis on adjuncts. Some emphasis also on the benefits of technology and impact on courses, faculty, staff, students and administration. More study of the end products of the M-DCC system – the graduates." *Institutional Research will be doing a Graduate Survey this year and will explore the other suggestions with areas of the College that manage these data.*

"More information on performance-based results, and suggestions for improvement at the College." *Institutional Research is currently preparing a capsule update on the College's Performance Based Budgeting allocation for 2001-02.*

"Development of marketing/enrollment management data to facilitate program evaluation and development." *Institutional Research will be working closely with the Enrollment Management Initiative at the College to address information needs.*

"I'd like to see more academic research. Are programs/courses effective? What happens to students who complete college prep, but can't pass the college prep exit test? How many students complete EAP/ESL but need college prep ..." *The research agenda provided to Institutional Research by the Academic Deans included items related to this comment. Research Notes, Capsules, and Reports related to some of these specific suggestions can be found on the web (see Information Capsule 2000-09C, Research Note 1/2/2001, Research Note 3/2/2001, and Information Capsule 2001-01C for example).*

Final Note

Institutional Research is very pleased with the number of survey responses received and with the excellent feedback obtained. Results were overwhelmingly favorable for all three areas of service – publications, web site, and special research requests. We plan to address suggestions for improvement as noted above, but believe that the survey results indicate that the office is achieving the positive results expected in the role of information resource. Thank you to everyone who responded to the survey and welcome to the new users of Institutional Research services.

Table 1
Survey Respondents by Job Role

Role	Number	Percent
Management	102	31%
Faculty	73	22%
Staff	139	42%
Other	18	5%
Total	**332**	**100%**

Table 2
Survey Respondents by Area of Responsibility

Responsibility	Number	Percent
Academic Affairs	47	14%
Classroom	74	22%
Student Services	96	29%
Business/Finance	18	5%
Other	97	29%
Total	**332**	**100%**

Table 3
Use of Services by Job Role of Survey Respondents

		Received Publications		Visited IR Web		Requested Special Information	
Role	Number	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent
Management	102	75	74%	54	53%	59	58%
Faculty	73	25	34%	12	16%	12	16%
Staff	139	29	21%	28	20%	16	12%
Other	18	5	28%	7	39%	3	17%
Total	**332**	**134**	**40%**	**101**	**30%**	**90**	**27%**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 4
Institutional Research User Satisfaction Survey
Items Related to Publications by Job Role*

Role	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Unable to Rate		Total		% Agree of
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Able to Rate
Institutional Research Publications Report on Issues and Topics Relevant to M-DCC													
Management	39	52%	36	48%	0	-	0	-	0	-	75	100%	**100%**
Faculty	9	38%	15	63%	0	-	0	-	0	-	24	100%	**100%**
Staff	9	31%	18	62%	0	-	0	-	2	7%	29	100%	**100%**
Other	2	50%	1	25%	0	-	0	-	1	25%	4	100%	**100%**
Total	**59**	**45%**	**70**	**53%**	**0**	**-**	**0**	**-**	**3**	**2%**	**132**	**100%**	**100%**
Institutional Research Publications are Distributed in a Timely Fashion													
Management	23	32%	43	59%	4	5%	0	-	3	4%	73	100%	**94%**
Faculty	7	32%	12	55%	1	5%	0	-	2	9%	22	100%	**95%**
Staff	10	34%	17	59%	1	3%	0	-	1	3%	29	100%	**96%**
Other	1	25%	1	25%	0	-	0	-	2	50%	4	100%	**100%**
Total	**41**	**32%**	**73**	**57%**	**6**	**5%**	**0**	**-**	**8**	**6%**	**128**	**100%**	**95%**
Institutional Research Publications are Useful in Decision-Making													
Management	24	33%	37	51%	6	8%	0	-	6	8%	73	100%	**91%**
Faculty	3	13%	11	46%	3	13%	0	-	7	29%	24	100%	**82%**
Staff	8	29%	14	50%	3	11%	0	-	3	11%	28	100%	**88%**
Other	2	50%	1	25%	0	-	0	-	1	25%	4	100%	**100%**
Total	**37**	**29%**	**63**	**49%**	**12**	**9%**	**0**	**-**	**17**	**13%**	**129**	**100%**	**89%**
Institutional Research Publications are Well Written													
Management	35	47%	39	52%	0	-	0	-	1	1%	75	100%	**100%**
Faculty	6	26%	17	74%	0	-	0	-	0	-	23	100%	**100%**
Staff	10	37%	16	59%	0	-	0	-	1	4%	27	100%	**100%**
Other	3	75%	1	25%	0	-	0	-	0	-	4	100%	**100%**
Total	**54**	**42%**	**73**	**57%**	**0**	**-**	**0**	**-**	**2**	**2%**	**129**	**100%**	**100%**
Institutional Research Publications are Easy to Understand													
Management	29	40%	38	52%	6	8%	0	-	0	-	73	100%	**92%**
Faculty	8	33%	15	63%	1	4%	0	-	0	-	24	100%	**96%**
Staff	9	32%	17	61%	1	4%	0	-	1	4%	28	100%	**96%**
Other	1	25%	3	75%	0	-	0	-	0	-	4	100%	**100%**
Total	**47**	**36%**	**73**	**57%**	**8**	**6%**	**0**	**-**	**1**	**1%**	**129**	**100%**	**94%**
Institutional Research Publications are Interesting and Informative													
Management	30	42%	40	56%	1	1%	0	-	0	-	71	100%	**99%**
Faculty	7	29%	16	67%	1	4%	0	-	0	-	24	100%	**96%**
Staff	10	36%	16	57%	2	7%	0	-	0	-	28	100%	**93%**
Other	1	25%	3	75%	0	-	0	-	0	-	4	100%	**100%**
Total	**48**	**38%**	**75**	**59%**	**4**	**3%**	**0**	**-**	**0**	**-**	**127**	**100%**	**97%**
Institutional Research Publications are Accurate													
Management	21	29%	27	37%	3	4%	0	-	22	30%	73	100%	**94%**
Faculty	6	26%	6	26%	0	-	0	-	11	48%	23	100%	**100%**
Staff	7	25%	11	39%	1	4%	0	-	9	32%	28	100%	**95%**
Other	1	25%	1	25%	0	-	0	-	2	50%	4	100%	**100%**
Total	**35**	**27%**	**45**	**35%**	**4**	**3%**	**0**	**-**	**44**	**34%**	**127**	**100%**	**95%**
Institutional Research Publications are Objective													
Management	32	44%	32	44%	2	3%	0	-	7	10%	73	100%	**97%**
Faculty	6	26%	10	43%	1	4%	0	-	6	26%	23	100%	**94%**
Staff	9	33%	12	44%	0	-	0	-	6	22%	27	100%	**100%**
Other	2	50%	1	25%	0	-	0	-	1	25%	4	100%	**100%**
Total	**49**	**39%**	**55**	**43%**	**3**	**2%**	**0**	**-**	**20**	**16%**	**127**	**100%**	**97%**

*Only respondents who indicated that they had received publications are included.

Table 5

Institutional Research User Satisfaction Survey

Items Related to Web Site by Job Role*

Role	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Unable to Rate		Total		% Agree of
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Able to Rate
The Information on Institutional Research's Web Site is Frequently Needed													
Management	18	34%	31	58%	2	4%	0	-	2	4%	53	100%	**96%**
Faculty	3	27%	6	55%	2	18%	0	-	0	-	11	100%	**82%**
Staff	6	21%	17	61%	3	11%	0	-	2	7%	28	100%	**88%**
Other	2	33%	2	33%	1	17%	0	-	1	17%	6	100%	**80%**
Total	**29**	**30%**	**56**	**57%**	**8**	**8%**	**0**	**-**	**5**	**0%**	**98**	**100%**	**91%**
The Information on Institutional Research's Web Site is Easy to Access													
Management	33	61%	19	35%	2	4%	0	-	0	-	54	100%	**96%**
Faculty	3	27%	7	64%	1	9%	0	-	0	-	11	100%	**91%**
Staff	6	21%	20	71%	1	4%	1	4%	0	-	28	100%	**93%**
Other	4	67%	2	33%	0	-	0	-	0	-	6	100%	**100%**
Total	**46**	**46%**	**48**	**48%**	**4**	**4%**	**1**	**1%**	**0**	**-**	**99**	**100%**	**95%**
The Information on Institutional Research's Web Site is Accurate													
Management	20	38%	20	38%	2	4%	0	-	10	19%	52	100%	**95%**
Faculty	2	18%	5	45%	0	-	0	-	4	36%	11	100%	**100%**
Staff	7	25%	13	46%	1	4%	0	-	7	25%	28	100%	**95%**
Other	3	50%	2	33%	0	-	0	-	1	17%	6	100%	**100%**
Total	**32**	**33%**	**40**	**41%**	**3**	**3%**	**0**	**-**	**22**	**23%**	**97**	**100%**	**96%**
The Information on Institutional Research's Web Site is Current													
Management	20	37%	28	52%	4	7%	1	2%	1	2%	54	100%	**91%**
Faculty	2	22%	5	56%	1	11%	0	-	1	11%	9	100%	**88%**
Staff	7	25%	13	46%	3	11%	1	4%	4	14%	28	100%	**83%**
Other	2	40%	2	40%	0	-	0	-	1	20%	5	100%	**100%**
Total	**31**	**32%**	**48**	**50%**	**8**	**8%**	**2**	**2%**	**7**	**7%**	**96**	**100%**	**89%**
The Information on Institutional Research's Web Site is Comprehensive													
Management	17	32%	31	58%	3	6%	0	-	2	4%	53	100%	**94%**
Faculty	3	33%	5	56%	1	11%	0	-	0	-	9	100%	**89%**
Staff	5	18%	18	64%	2	7%	0	-	3	11%	28	100%	**92%**
Other	2	33%	3	50%	0	-	0	-	1	17%	6	100%	**100%**
Total	**27**	**28%**	**57**	**59%**	**6**	**6%**	**0**	**-**	**6**	**6%**	**96**	**100%**	**93%**

*Only respondents who indicated that they had visited the web site are included

Table 6

Institutional Research User Satisfaction Survey

Items Related to Requests for Special Information or Research by Job Role*

Role	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Unable to Rate		Total		% Agree of
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Able to Rate
Institutional Research Staff are Helpful													
Management	43	74%	15	26%	0	-	0	-	0	-	58	100%	**100%**
Faculty	6	50%	4	33%	1	8%	1	8%	0	-	12	100%	**83%**
Staff	10	63%	6	38%	0	-	0	-	0	-	16	100%	**100%**
Other	3	100%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	3	100%	**100%**
Total	**62**	**70%**	**25**	**28%**	**1**	**1%**	**1**	**1%**	**0**	**-**	**89**	**100%**	**98%**
Institutional Research Staff are Knowledgable													
Management	39	67%	18	31%	0	-	0	-	1	2%	58	100%	**100%**
Faculty	6	50%	3	25%	1	8%	1	8%	1	8%	12	100%	**82%**
Staff	8	50%	8	50%	0	-	0	-	0	-	16	100%	**100%**
Other	3	100%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	3	100%	**100%**
Total	**56**	**63%**	**29**	**33%**	**1**	**1%**	**1**	**1%**	**2**	**2%**	**89**	**100%**	**98%**
Institutional Research Provides the Special Information Needed													
Management	40	68%	18	31%	0	-	0	-	1	2%	59	100%	**100%**
Faculty	6	50%	3	25%	2	17%	1	8%	0	-	12	100%	**75%**
Staff	8	50%	8	50%	0	-	0	-	0	-	16	100%	**100%**
Other	3	100%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	3	100%	**100%**
Total	**57**	**63%**	**29**	**32%**	**2**	**2%**	**1**	**1%**	**1**	**1%**	**90**	**100%**	**97%**
Institutional Research Provides the Research Assistance Needed													
Management	39	68%	13	23%	1	2%	0	-	4	7%	57	100%	**98%**
Faculty	4	44%	2	22%	2	22%	0	-	1	11%	9	100%	**75%**
Staff	8	50%	8	50%	0	-	0	-	0	-	16	100%	**100%**
Other	3	100%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	3	100%	**100%**
Total	**54**	**64%**	**23**	**27%**	**3**	**4%**	**0**	**-**	**5**	**6%**	**85**	**100%**	**96%**
Institutional Research Suggests Alternative if Unable to Provide Needed Service													
Management	29	50%	17	29%	2	3%	1	2%	9	16%	58	100%	**94%**
Faculty	1	9%	4	36%	1	9%	0	-	5	45%	11	100%	**83%**
Staff	5	31%	6	38%	0	-	0	-	5	31%	16	100%	**100%**
Other	3	100%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	3	100%	**100%**
Total	**38**	**43%**	**27**	**31%**	**3**	**3%**	**1**	**1%**	**19**	**22%**	**88**	**100%**	**94%**
Institutional Research Responds Within a Reasonable Amount of Time to Special Requests													
Management	38	66%	18	31%	0	-	0	-	2	3%	58	100%	**100%**
Faculty	5	45%	4	36%	1	9%	0	-	1	9%	11	100%	**90%**
Staff	10	63%	6	38%	0	-	0	-	0	-	16	100%	**100%**
Other	3	100%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	3	100%	**100%**
Total	**56**	**64%**	**28**	**32%**	**1**	**1%**	**0**	**-**	**3**	**3%**	**88**	**100%**	**99%**
Institutional Research Provides Information and Assistance That is Understandable													
Management	39	67%	19	33%	0	-	0	-	0	-	58	100%	**100%**
Faculty	5	45%	6	55%	0	-	0	-	0	-	11	100%	**100%**
Staff	7	47%	7	47%	0	-	0	-	1	7%	15	100%	**100%**
Other	3	100%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	3	100%	**100%**
Total	**54**	**62%**	**32**	**37%**	**0**	**-**	**0**	**-**	**1**	**1%**	**87**	**100%**	**100%**

*Only respondents who indicated that they had requested special information or research are included

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH EFFECTIVENESS PLAN 2000-2001

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE (Umbrella type statements that capture our contribution to the college – our 'reason for being')	EXPECTED RESULTS (What we expect to see if we are fulfilling our purpose – how we can tell we are doing our job)	STRATEGIES (How we attempt to achieve the results – approaches used, steps taken, plans followed, etc.)	ASSESSMENT METHODS (How we can measure our success. Examples are surveys, reduction of errors in database, reports, etc.)	ASSESSMENT RESULTS (What the assessment told us about how well we achieved our intended results)	USE OF RESULTS (How we can change and improve based on what we have learned about our effectiveness)
1. To serve as an information resource for the College.	The College and outside users will be given accurate information to meet data needs and support decision-making.	Provide information through a variety of formats to effectively reach all interested parties.	User surveys.	Pending May,2001 survey results	
	Information Capsules, Research Reports, and Research Notes will address issues pertinent to the College, contain accurate data, and be distributed efficiently.	Stay informed on issues affecting the college by interacting with committees, College leadership, legislative liaison, etc. Maintain a consistent data collection schedule to assure comparability across years. Proofread all reports prior to distribution for accuracy. Maintain up-to-date distribution lists	User Surveys Reader interest will be assessed by number of requests for reports, capsules. Number of reports/capsules re-issued due to errors.	Pending May, 2001 survey results 3 reports published with 67 copies requested in 2000. 3 reports published with 102 copies requested in 2001. 15 capsules published in 2000 and 4 to date in 2001 sent to a distribution list of 262 people. 40 additional copies requested and 9 people asked to be added to distribution list. 5 Research notes published in 2000 and sent to 40 people each. 3 Research notes to date in 2001 sent to 50 people each. 2 Testing Info notes published in 2000 sent to 45 people each. No publications re-issued due to errors but one capsule re-issued to include addtl. detail for Hialeah Center per request.	Summaries of reports, capsules and notes by topic area will be prepared to review coverage of relevant issues.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE (Umbrella type statements that capture our contribution to the college – our 'reason for being')	EXPECTED RESULTS (What we expect to see if we are fulfilling our purpose – how we can tell we are doing our job)	STRATEGIES (How we attempt to achieve the results – approaches used, steps taken, plans followed, etc.)	ASSESSMENT METHODS (How we can measure our success. Examples are surveys, reduction of errors in database, reports, etc.)	ASSESSMENT RESULTS (What the assessment told us about how well we achieved our intended results)	USE OF RESULTS (How we can change and improve based on what we have learned about our effectiveness)
1. To serve as an information resource for the College (Continued)	IR web page information will meet or exceed the routine data needs of the College and outside users.	Maintain term and annual demographics as well as other descriptive data on the web and update annually or by term as appropriate. Refer to overall data requests to determine if recurrent requests warrant development of new web pages. Participate in the college-wide work group on web design to minimize duplication of effort and prevent posting of conflicting or redundant data.	Number or yearly 'hits' on IR web page. Analysis of electronic 'comments' section when established. User Surveys.	20,144 hits since April, 98. Approx. yearly hits about 6,700. Two comments received – both from students looking for information and both needed to be directed to other areas of the college web site.	
	Special data requests from district and campus personnel and outside users will be completed in a timely manner Special requests for research and program evaluation will be conducted as priorities allow.	Maintain analytical skills sufficient to complete data requests. Maintain expertise with college data files and individual areas of data expertise. Schedule major recurring program evaluation data requests on the annual reports calendar so that work can begin in advance of receiving the request Assist users in clarifying data requests. Evaluate which of many resources is the best source of the needed information. Convey information by phone or memo if appropriate, or in a research report, capsule, etc. Maintain record of information provided	Number of data requests completed by area. Number and type of data requests IR is unable to complete –those we don't have info for but perhaps should. User survey	Currently compiling summaries of special data requests by area. Trouble filling annual enrollment data requests when needed was apparent. Currently have trouble filling 'cohort tracking' type requests. Currently limited in ability to track students into upper division enrollment, particularly in private or out-of state institutions. Pending May, 2001 survey results.	New annual data file was provided by AD for IR use in answering these questions. Annual headcounts added to IR Web. AD currently working on longitudinal file for IR use. AD currently adding 'old' student numbers to files to better track students whose ID numbers changed in conversion to Odyssey and after. Will explore transfer tracking options.

13

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE (Umbrella type statements that capture our contribution to the college – our 'reason for being')	EXPECTED RESULTS (What we expect to see if we are fulfilling our purpose – how we can tell we are doing our job)	STRATEGIES (How we attempt to achieve the results – approaches used, steps taken, plans followed, etc.)	ASSESSMENT METHODS (How we can measure our success. Examples are surveys, reduction of errors in database, reports, etc.)	ASSESSMENT RESULTS (What the assessment told us about how well we achieved our intended results)	USE OF RESULTS (How we can change and improve based on what we have learned about our effectiveness)
1. To serve as an information resource for the College (Continued)	Enrollment monitoring reports will be prepared and distributed in a timely manner to meet the needs of the college community.	Create and maintain a calendar of run and distribution dates Maintain an up-to-date distribution list. Maintain comparative data.	Percent of reports distributed on time (day of receipt of data unless report is classified as 'no distribution' by Director). Number of errors or reissued reports. Number of people using the enrollment monitoring report.	100% of reports distributed on time. 2 errors detected – one on headcount total when hard number was entered instead of using formula; and one on summary spreadsheet when number was entered incorrectly. 124 people receive the enrollment monitoring report via e-mail. 35 additional requested to be added to the list in 2000-01.	Continue keeping personnel trained as back up to prepare enrollment reports as needed. Using formulas whenever possible and doublechecking numbers against printouts. Linking summary spreadsheet to original document to eliminate need to enter numbers. Continue distributing enrollment reports via e-mail until an on-line system is ready. Work on on-line enrollment reporting (EIS).
	Data will be available as needed for grants submissions.	Schedule major recurring grant data requests on the annual reports calendar so that work can begin in advance of receiving the requests.	Number of grant proposals IR provided data for.	Title III Eligibility – all campuses. Title V proposals – Kendall, IAC, Medical 'Careers for Florida's Future' Incentive Grant Should keep track of requests we were unable to supply specific information for.	Will note requests that we were unable to fill to determine if we can gain access to data needed.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE (Umbrella type statements that capture our contribution to the college – our 'reason for being')	EXPECTED RESULTS (What we expect to see if we are fulfilling our purpose – how we can tell we are doing our job)	STRATEGIES (How we attempt to achieve the results – approaches used, steps taken, plans followed, etc.)	ASSESSMENT METHODS (How we can measure our success. Examples are surveys, reduction of errors in database, reports, etc.)	ASSESSMENT RESULTS (What the assessment told us about how well we achieved our intended results)	USE OF RESULTS (How we can change and improve based on what we have learned about our effectiveness)
2. To meet state and federal reporting requirements	The student database will be generated, verified, and submitted 5 times per year as required.	Conduct detailed data verification between SDB Data Elements (Critical and informational errors). Conduct detailed data verification between SDB Data Elements and other data sources (CCPF, IRS40, etc). Conduct detailed data verification between SDB Data Elements and source data (Odyssey files). Work with Applications Development to ensure that programming that creates database is as accurate as possible. Work in cooperation with other departments (Registration, Financial Aid, Academic Affairs, Testing, etc) to assure accurate data in MDCC system files. Learn the new Odyssey system to be able to investigate SDB data discrepancies. Provide direction for Applications Development to correct SDB errors prior to submission. Download and verify State produced reports. Work in cooperation with other colleges and Division personnel to assure consistent data reporting. Work in cooperation with other consortia schools to assure accurate and efficient data collection.	Number of critical errors on initial run that are fixed before the final run. Number of inaccuracies in state reports and files detected after submission. Number of initial submissions after SDB Closeout date. Number of letters to president because of late submission of files. Number of resubmissions after SDB closing date because of data errors. Number of errors detected in audit.	15 critical errors fixed before submission in 1999-1; 17 in 1999-2; 12 in 2000-1; and 13 in 2000-2. 1 error detected after submission. Inaccuracies constantly monitored. No late submissions or letters to president. No resubmissions after closing.	Assessment method will be changed in the next plan to capture work involved in catching discrepancies before they become errors. Data corrections will be tracked in the future, not just critical errors corrected. IR will continue to monitor Odyssey data collection and SDB capture, suggesting changes as needed.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE (Umbrella type statements that capture our contribution to the college – our 'reason for being')	EXPECTED RESULTS (What we expect to see if we are fulfilling our purpose – how we can tell we are doing our job)	STRATEGIES (How we attempt to achieve the results – approaches used, steps taken, plans followed, etc.)	ASSESSMENT METHODS (How we can measure our success. Examples are surveys, reduction of errors in database, reports, etc.)	ASSESSMENT RESULTS (What the assessment told us about how well we achieved our intended results)	USE OF RESULTS (How we can change and improve based on what we have learned about our effectiveness)
2. To meet state and federal reporting requirements (Continued)	State Accountability data will be monitored and verified to ensure accuracy. State equity data will be verified or provided from local sources.	Compare Accountability and Equity data with past years and clarify discrepancies through consultation with experts. Report inaccuracies to the state in a timely manner.	Number of errors found and corrected. Number of uncorrected errors in state published data on M-DCC.	1. Incorrect GPA information reported by Odyssey on SDB – picked up in Accountability Reports. 2. Student number mismatches due to Odyssey conversion will effect Accountability Reports. 3. College prep completion Accountability measure needs to be cleaned up – problems with Odyssey picking up completion flag from placement demographic screen. 4. State licensure pass rates undercounted.	SDB resubmitted with correct GPA information – Division agreed to run reports again. Working with Division to accurately match students with new numbers. Working with programmers to correct Odyssey problem affecting completion flag Division notified and are aware but apparently unable to correct.
	Information for other required reports will be provided in a timely manner (e.g. annual Equity Report, IPEDS grad rate survey, Excess credits analysis, Perkins, Title III, Title V, College Board, Building Construction, etc.)	Schedule required reports on the annual reports calendar so that work can begin in advance of receiving the request from the State. Prepare data analysis programs to produce and/or verify data for required reports as needed. Become familiar with internal information sources required to complete and/or verify reports as needed.	Number of required reports submitted late.	None	Continue scheduling report deadlines and working ahead as in the past.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE (Umbrella type statements that capture our contribution to the college – our 'reason for being')	EXPECTED RESULTS (What we expect to see if we are fulfilling our purpose – how we can tell we are doing our job)	STRATEGIES (How we attempt to achieve the results – approaches used, steps taken, plans followed, etc.)	ASSESSMENT METHODS (How we can measure our success. Examples are surveys, reduction of errors in database, reports, etc.)	ASSESSMENT RESULTS (What the assessment told us about how well we achieved our intended results)	USE OF RESULTS (How we can change and improve based on what we have learned about our effectiveness)
2. To meet state and federal reporting requirements (Continued)	Annual budget enrollment projections, and FTE enrollment projections will be prepared through campus input, approved by executive leadership, updated during the year, and reported to the state as required. State outyear FTE projections will be analyzed using demographic data and adjusted as necessary.	Gather information from appropriate campus personnel and prepare with projection spreadsheets. Update data at the close of each term. Analyze projected county demographics and High School graduates as they relate to M-DCC FTE. Establish and follow approval process prior to scheduled submission dates. Submit data electronically to the state as required.	Internal projections for the following year are completed on time (April) Number of State required projections submitted late.	Not completed until May 2001 due to incorporation of School projections. None.	Data collection and display will be moved to online EIS system.
	IR will be able to confirm accuracy of information when State Auditors request data verification.	Investigate and provide written verification in response to all State Auditors data requests.	Number of audit questions successfully/ unsuccessfully resolved	Financial Aid Audit : Right to Know data – had but needed to post.	Created Web Page with consumer info.
3. To capture data related to placements and outcomes in workforce education programs.	M-DCC will receive credit for all possible graduations and placements resulting from vocational program enrollment.	Examine match of enrollment and graduation data against State files. Make placement decisions, conduct supplemental follow-up, enter results, and transmit electronically with file (FETPIP).	Number of additional placements added through local follow-up (compared to last report year).	117 additional positive placements achieved through local surveys. This compares to 78 the previous year All schools had additional placements for 98-99 graduates.	Will continue to conduct local surveys and supplement FETPIP placements as this boosts placement/success rates of many programs.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE (Umbrella type statements that capture our contribution to the college – our 'reason for being')	EXPECTED RESULTS (What we expect to see if we are fulfilling our purpose – how we can tell we are doing our job)	STRATEGIES (How we attempt to achieve the results – approaches used, steps taken, plans followed, etc.)	ASSESSMENT METHODS (How we can measure our success. Examples are surveys, reduction of errors in database, reports, etc.)	ASSESSMENT RESULTS (What the assessment told us about how well we achieved our intended results)	USE OF RESULTS (How we can change and improve based on what we have learned about our effectiveness)
3. To capture data related to placements and outcomes in workforce education programs (con't.)	M-DCC will receive all possible OCPs and LCPs for vocational and adult basic education/GED students.	Provide SAS programming to capture and report OCPs and LCPs until Odyssey production programming is in place. Analyze enrollments in courses designated as leading to OCPs. Examine students course taking patterns to highlight problems in OCP definition. Meet with EPPA, Cluster directors/program managers to present results from above.	Number of OCPs and LCPs on SDB from IR SAS programming (compared to last report year) Number of OCPs redefined due to these efforts	3,919 LCPs captured in 2000-01; 4,416 in 1999-00 as a result of IR SAS programming. 1,935 PSAV OCPs captured in 2000-01; 1,792 in 1999-00 as a result of IR SAS programming. No OCPs completely redefined. Program managers seem to have become more lenient in allowing course substitutions.	IR has been instrumental in capturing OCPs and LCPs to date. For next year, Odyssey programs will be run parallel to IR programs to determine which captures most effectively. IR could work more directly with program managers in suggesting actions to increase OCPs. AS OCPs replaced by PPPs. IR must coordinate Odyssey capture and submission, and validate accuracy over next year.
	Program managers will have information needed to evaluate program productivity.	Produce data on program productivity in various formats.	Number of requests filled for School Directors, Discipline Chairs.	At least 26 different requests for program productivity information or activities that promote productivity were completed. This does not include small info requests that aren't logged in queues. Information related to enrollments, completions, placements, fundable outcomes, demographics of students, etc. Activities related to supplemental follow-up for placements, program code fixes, graduation checks, etc.	Requests and activities will be reviewed with the intent that work can be streamlined. Some of the information could be placed on the web EIS system, Odyssey fixes and enhancements may lessen the need for some of the activities. Related reports and capsules will continue to be produced. Workforce research summaries are planned.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE (Umbrella type statements that capture our contribution to the college – our 'reason for being')	EXPECTED RESULTS (What we expect to see if we are fulfilling our purpose – how we can tell we are doing our job)	STRATEGIES (How we attempt to achieve the results – approaches used, steps taken, plans followed, etc.)	ASSESSMENT METHODS (How we can measure our success. Examples are surveys, reduction of errors in database, reports, etc.)	ASSESSMENT RESULTS (What the assessment told us about how well we achieved our intended results)	USE OF RESULTS (How we can change and improve based on what we have learned about our effectiveness)
4 To coordinate college-wide testing programs through the Campus Testing Departments	Campus Testing Departments will have the guidance and support needed to provide consistent, efficient, and secure testing services to students. M-DCC students, personnel, and outside users will be able to access up-to-date, consistent testing information and guidelines.	Provide information through various formats to Campus Testing Directors. Order testing supplies and materials for college-wide tests. Receive and process test scores as appropriate in a timely way. Update testing information and procedures regularly to keep current.	User surveys.	Survey expected to be ready to administer 8/2001	
	In cooperation with Applications Development & Odyssey Project Office, the student system software will meet testing and placement needs.	Submit programming requests for required changes.	Error reports and feedback from Testing personnel.	Minimal errors were reported – enhancements to CLAST registration system and test score entry screens made.	Will continue to monitor the student system software, document problems and submit solutions.
	The annual Placement Criteria document will be prepared through campus input.	Gather placement recommendations/changes from college personnel and discipline committees & incorporate into document. Monitor timelines and deadlines to determine reasons for any missed deadlines or delays.	Placement changes are made in time for Fall term implementation (by July 1st).	Deadlines were met so the document was approved before 7/1/2001 in spite of some confusion and lack of communication about Campus CASSC presentations.	Placement Criteria Process overview will be revised to include Campus CASSC presentations and the process will begin earlier.
	District testing accounts will be managed to ensure adequate resources for test materials, test information brochures, and test administration.	Monitor testing budgets and expenses. Prepare annual board item for entry level testing materials. Monitor budget balances to determine adequacy of initial budget and appropriateness of expenditures.	Number of requests for additional funds to supplement testing budgets.	No additional funds requested. Budget request for 2001-02 reduced due to better record-keeping of tests used and carry-over from previous year.	Will revise projection process next year to deduct test center inventories of tests from projections. Estimates based on expected increase or decrease not just on past usage.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE (Umbrella type statements that capture our contribution to the college – our 'reason for being')	EXPECTED RESULTS (What we expect to see if we are fulfilling our purpose – how we can tell we are doing our job)	STRATEGIES (How we attempt to achieve the results – approaches used, steps taken, plans followed, etc.)	ASSESSMENT METHODS (How we can measure our success. Examples are surveys, reduction of errors in database, reports, etc.)	ASSESSMENT RESULTS (What the assessment told us about how well we achieved our intended results)	USE OF RESULTS (How we can change and improve based on what we have learned about our effectiveness)
4 To coordinate college-wide testing programs through the Campus Testing Departments (Continued)	Coordinate CLAST Waiver Program.	Receive, review and distribute CLAST Waiver requests. Prepare communications related to the waiver review process. Ensure that all required steps are followed.	Number of waivers processed with all required steps followed/ not followed.	Fifty-seven waiver requests processed 7/1/00 – 6/30/01. Review of requests show that some were missing documentation and/or required signatures.	Guidelines for submitting appropriate documentation will be included and checklist revised to encourage better adherence to procedures. Procedures are also being revised and updated.
5 To facilitate the administration of faculty and supervisor feedback programs.	Feedback programs will be administered consistently through the Campus Testing departments.	Provide information to Campus Testing Directors, Applications Development, Academic Deans, and Chairpersons as required. Prepare information for distribution to faculty. Monitor feedback schedule to ensure deadlines are met. Review feedback process periodically to determine problems or areas needing improvement.	User survey.	Survey expected to be ready to administer in Aug, 2001.	
	In cooperation with Applications Development, programming will support and meet the needs of the feedback programs.	Submit programming requests and provide direction to programmers.	Review of programming requests and completed work.	A number of program changes were made successfully in the past year; also, enhancement to the system.	Continue working closely with AD to facilitate needed changes and enhancements.
	Analyses of the feedback instruments and expertise will be provided as requested.	Prepare validity studies as requested and act as resource on survey construction and administration as requested.	Review work on student feedback	Provided information on feedback administration irregularities (late packets, comments received, etc.) Provided assistance in interpretation of results, aggregate response files maintained.	

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE (Umbrella type statements that capture our contribution to the college – our 'reason for being')	EXPECTED RESULTS (What we expect to see if we are fulfilling our purpose – how we can tell we are doing our job)	STRATEGIES (How we attempt to achieve the results – approaches used, steps taken, plans followed, etc.)	ASSESSMENT METHODS (How we can measure our success. Examples are surveys, reduction of errors in database, reports, etc.)	ASSESSMENT RESULTS (What the assessment told us about how well we achieved our intended results)	USE OF RESULTS (How we can change and improve based on what we have learned about our effectiveness)
6 To assist the College in the Strategic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness processes.	Expertise, assistance, and guidance will be provided to units in developing institutional effectiveness plans. Leadership in developing strategic plan will be provided as requested.	Serve on Institutional Effectiveness committee of CASSC and Strategic Planning coordinating committee. Meet with individual areas to assist in IE plan development as requested. Assist in developing and using appropriate assessment methods as needed.	Progress on Strategic Plan monitored. Acceptability of College Institutional Effectiveness Plan to College leadership and SACS.	Strategic Plan enthusiastically adopted by Board of Trustees; updated regularly to reflect progress toward strategic goals, annual update presented to Board. Strategic Plan was used for 2001-02 Vision budget request. IE Committee currently collecting information	Need to make plan more visible to college community. Managers' presentation planned for August, 2001.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Miami Dade Community College — Institutional Research

Institutional Research
Survey of Satisfaction with Services

What is your role at M-DCC?

- ○ Management
- ○ Faculty
- ○ Staff
- ○ Other

What is your area of responsibility?

- ○ Academic Affairs
- ○ Classroom
- ○ Student Services
- ○ Business & Finance
- ○ Other

Section I. Publications

Institutional Research publishes information in a variety of formats - research reports, information capsules, research notes, fact sheets, etc. Please answer the following questions about IR publications.

Have you received any IR publications?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No (if no, please skip to Section II)

Institutional Research publications...

* report on issues and topics relevant to M-DCC.
  ○ Strongly agree ○ Agree ○ Disagree ○ Strongly disagree ○ Unable to rate
* are distributed in a timely fashion.
  ○ Strongly agree ○ Agree ○ Disagree ○ Strongly disagree ○ Unable to rate
* are useful in decision-making.
  ○ Strongly agree ○ Agree ○ Disagree ○ Strongly disagree ○ Unable to rate
* are well written.
  ○ Strongly agree ○ Agree ○ Disagree ○ Strongly disagree ○ Unable to rate
* are easy to understand.
  ○ Strongly agree ○ Agree ○ Disagree ○ Strongly disagree ○ Unable to rate
* are interesting and informative.
  ○ Strongly agree ○ Agree ○ Disagree ○ Strongly disagree ○ Unable to rate
* are accurate.
  ○ Strongly agree ○ Agree ○ Disagree ○ Strongly disagree ○ Unable to rate
* are objective.
  ○ Strongly agree ○ Agree ○ Disagree ○ Strongly disagree ○ Unable to rate

Section II. Web Site

Institutional Research maintains a web site (www.mdcc.edu/mdcc/ir) that contains statistics on student enrollment and demographics, publication summaries, information on testing requirements, etc. Please answer the following questions about IR web site.

Have you visited the Institutional Research web site?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No (if no, please skip to Section III)

The information on Institutional Research's web site is...

* frequently needed.
  ○ Strongly agree ○ Agree ○ Disagree ○ Strongly disagree ○ Unable to rate
* easy to access.
  ○ Strongly agree ○ Agree ○ Disagree ○ Strongly disagree ○ Unable to rate
* accurate.
  ○ Strongly agree ○ Agree ○ Disagree ○ Strongly disagree ○ Unable to rate
* current.
  ○ Strongly agree ○ Agree ○ Disagree ○ Strongly disagree ○ Unable to rate
* comprehensive.
  ○ Strongly agree ○ Agree ○ Disagree ○ Strongly disagree ○ Unable to rate

Section III. Special Requests

Institutional Research responds to many special requests for information, research, and evaluation, assistance. Please answer the following questions about Institutional Research's response to special information requests.

Have you requested special information or research from Institutional Research?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No (if no, please skip to Section IV)

Institutional Research...

* staff are helpful.
  ○ Strongly agree ○ Agree ○ Disagree ○ Strongly disagree ○ Unable to rate
* staff are knowledgeable.
  ○ Strongly agree ○ Agree ○ Disagree ○ Strongly disagree ○ Unable to rate
* provides the special information needed.
  ○ Strongly agree ○ Agree ○ Disagree ○ Strongly disagree ○ Unable to rate
* provides the research assistance needed.
  ○ Strongly agree ○ Agree ○ Disagree ○ Strongly disagree ○ Unable to rate
* suggests alternative if unable to provide needed service.
  ○ Strongly agree ○ Agree ○ Disagree ○ Strongly disagree ○ Unable to rate
* responds within a reasonable amount of time to special requests.

C Strongly agree C Agree C Disagree C Strongly disagree C Unable to rate

* provides information and assistance that is understandable.

C Strongly agree C Agree C Disagree C Strongly disagree C Unable to rate

Section IV. Comments

What do you think Institutional Research does well?

In what areas do you think Institutional Research could improve?

Submit Reset

Institutional Research.
Miami-Dade Community College.
Revised: April 17, 2001

Miami-Dade Community College

MIAMI-DADE IS AN EQUAL ACCESS/EQUAL OPPORTUNITY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
AND DOES NOT DISCRIMINATE ON THE BASIS OF HANDICAP. 4/88